NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

SAMPLE APPLICATION NARRATIVE

America's Media Makers:
Development Grants

Institution: GWETA, Inc.

NATIONAL
ENDOWMENT
FOR THE
HUMANITIES

DIVISION OF PUBLIC PROGRAMS
1100 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506
ROOM 426
PUBLICPGMS@NEH.GOV
202/606-8269
WWW.NEH.GOV

SAMPLE PROPOSAL

This sample of the narrative portion from a grant is provided as an example of a funded proposal. It will give you a sense of how a successful application may be crafted. It is not intended to serve as a model. Every successful application is different, and each applicant is urged to prepare a proposal that reflects its unique project and aspirations. Prospective applicants are also strongly encouraged to consult with staff members in the NEH Division of Public Programs well before a grant deadline. This sample proposal does not include a budget, letters of commitment, or resumes. Please note that this document has been converted from a .pdf file, which may cause formatting errors. Images from the original document may have been removed.

Project Title: The Latino Americans

Institution: GWETA, Inc.

Project Director: Jeff Bieber

Grant Program: America's Media Makers

Grant Type: Development**,** TD-50032-09

The Latino Americans
Greater Washington Educational Telecom. Assoc.

A. Program Description

The Latino Americans will be an eight-hour film series, the chronicle of the arrival and lives of Latinos in the United States in the last 200 years – a story of people, politics, and culture from 1800 to 2008. The series is large in scale, but the film will go small as well: the changing and yet repeating context of American history is the big-picture backdrop for the drama of individual lives. Latinos now compose the largest minority group in the United States, so *The Latino Americans* will be a landmark media event that is already long overdue.

WETA, the Washington D.C. PBS station, will join forces with Latino Public Broadcasting to co-produce this project. The series will be created for national PBS broadcast, with a companion radio series on NPR, and will include a major outreach and promotional campaign. All programs and outreach will also be distributed via Spanish language media (broadcast, radio and web) to connect with Latino communities nationwide. Components will include a corresponding website, interactive teaching materials on the website, user-generated digital content that can be embedded on blogs, MySpace, and Facebook, a possible companion book, and a DVD set for home video and educational distribution. We will also form a partnership with StoryCorps, collecting oral histories for radio, the web and television. The total production budget for the series is projected to be approximately $[removed]. We are requesting $[removed] in funds from the National Endowment for the Humanities to finance in part the scripting budget. The intended outcome of the scripting phase is two-full scripts for the eight one-hour segments of the series.

B. Content and creative approach

I. Introduction to the Subject

The Latino Americans will encompass 200 years of history. It's a long and diverse story, as any history of the immigration of a major population and its aftermath must be – especially a story that hopes to describe what the U.S. Census enumerates as the largest ethnic group in the United States: over 45 million people.

Immigration is at the heart of American experience, and a central part of the long-running democratic experiment that is the United States. Over a half century ago, Oscar Handlin opened his epochal study *The Uprooted* with this*:* "Once I thought to write a history of the immigrants in America. Then I discovered that the immigrants *were* American history." So it is that our series intersects much that is central to the history of the United States. The story includes expansionism, Manifest Destiny, the Wild West, multiple wars (Mexican-American, Spanish-American, World War II), the rise of organized labor, the

Great Depression, the post WWII boom, the Cold War, the Civil Rights movement, globalization, and the effects of multiple kinds of technologies – from the railroad and barbed wire to the internet and satellite television.

Despite such familiar landmarks, our history will go to places where standard U.S. histories do not tend to tread. The series will be driven by the human dramas of our characters, both historical personages (in earlier episodes) and living ones. They are people whose stories tell us much about their times. We'll hear of a foundling, an orphan girl sent north to an isolated mission in Spanish California in 1800; of a group of 19th-century New Mexico shepherds who became masked night-riders (some say terrorists) in white hats; of the refined young poet in the 1890s who was also a leading Cuban revolutionary… in New York City; of an American-born girl in the Depression who was deported to Mexico, a place where she had never been; of a decorated World War II soldier from Texas who returned a hero, yet was not allowed to drink coffee in a (segregated) diner in his hometown; of a migrant farmworker who entered the U.S. by repeatedly "going over the fence"; of a Puerto Rican kid in an East Harlem gang who did drugs and hard time in prison, then became a best-selling author by writing about it; of the woman who was César Chávez's right-hand "man" in the grape strike in the 1960s; of a Cuban girl who arrived in the United States alone at age six, yet managed, in the end, to become a university professor; of an El Salvadoran boy who came to school one day in the 1980s to find his classroom drenched in blood and several classmates missing.

There will be pop cultural heroes – from Dolores del Rio to Orlando Cepeda to Willie Colón to Rita Moreno to America Ferrer, in both glitzy and very human aspects – and notable Latinos like César Chávez and Julia Alvarez. But we'll also show the kinds of characters who are rare in survey histories: what you could call average people. In recent times history has begun to focus on ordinary lives rather than simply the most prominent ones; so it is that our characters include a barber, a housewife, a miner, a migrant worker, a teacher, and more. In history today, such people have started to matter, just as presidents and generals always have, for a common life can reveal an uncommon world.

"History is a noise in the street," James Joyce once wrote – an event that takes place just out of our sight, in the public places of the world but at the borders of our lives. Perhaps history is the sum total of those noises in the street, a symphony of chaos. For Latino Americans, many of those sounds have gone unheard, for many of them have been among the invisible men and women of the American narrative. But in this series the viewer will truly hear the music of Latino American history.

Our series is a historical one, stretching over 200 years. The final program reaches the present day, but the series is not a debate of the current hot-button political issues surrounding immigration. However, we do not pretend that our story exists in a political vacuum.

In the early 1990s, the United States government started building a wall. In part it is a literal wall, a physical barrier between the U.S. and Mexico – a wall that will eventually be 700 miles of corrugated steel, salmon-colored concrete, or double chain-link bristling

with barbed wire. Some of the wall will even be virtual: "the most technologically advanced border security initiative in American history," as President Bush said. The wall is costing billions, and its purpose is clear: to halt illegal immigration. Every week, federal agents stop 10,000 people from making an illegal crossing; the vast majority of them are Latino.

In 1970 there were under 10 million Spanish-speaking people in the U.S.; today there are 45 million, making Latinos suddenly *the* largest ethnic or racial minority in the country. There are more Spanish speakers in the U.S. now than there are in, for example, Spain. Projected figures are even more astounding. The Latino population will triple (again) by 2050. By mid-century, non-Hispanic whites, also called Anglo Americans, will make up less than half the country.

With such a stunning reversal of demographic fortune in the cards, perhaps it isn't surprising that over the past ten years the American debate over illegal immigration has been white with heat – in Congress and state legislatures, in the media, on the streets. According to a poll taken by the Pew Center, a majority of Americans are concerned that the nation's 12 million undocumented Latino immigrants are putting a strain on public funds to subsidize their education and medical care. In 2006 the House of Representatives passed a bill to declare all illegal immigrants felons. In response, over two million people in 102 American cities marched in protest.

Ideals that were once considered twin "goods," *unity* and *diversity*, have become polar opposites in the minds of many Americans. In other words, an emblematic Wall is also being built: a great divide between Anglo and Latino peoples.

As the series will amply show, antipathy toward immigrants is not new. There has always been fear of difference, a widespread distrust of people who were not "American." In the mid-1800s that fear crystallized around the wave of Irish "Papists" – "a pest wherever they go," according to one Boston newspaper; by the turn of the century the immigrant scapegoats were Italians and Jews, and in 1924 Congress passed the most restrictive immigration law in US history – a law directed at everyone in the rest of the world *except* people from the Western Hemisphere. "Many of the patterns of the most recent wave of anti-immigrant sentiment are eerily reminiscent of earlier period of American nativism," writes Project Scholar David Gutiérrez, and "much of the rhetoric about immigrants… is virtually identical to the anti-immigrant pronouncements that were commonly heard in the 1850s, 1890s, the 1920s, the 1950s, and again in the 1970s."

There was, however, another side to this historical truth. As Project Scholar John Faragher points out, "there were others who countered the anti-immigrant sentiment with arguments about the importance of opening the doors to all – [those who] finally, in the 1910s, came up with a positive argument about the importance of diversity."

At the very heart of *The Latino Americans* is the hope to break down the emblematic Wall – not in the literal sense (i.e., open the borders), but to impart an understanding of history that's crucial to both sides. We are famously a nation of immigrants, yet many of

us seem to fail to recognize what that means. One could remark, as Walt Kelly's cartoon sage Pogo did, "We have met the enemy, and they is us": if not the fathers, then the forefathers of those up in arms about immigration were immigrants themselves. Yet the general public has seldom had a window on the Latino experience, seldom been given a sense of the history behind 45 million people. Why have Latinos come to America and how did America come to them? Why are they still coming? What kind of world did they leave, what world did they find here, and what world are they building? How and why did Latinos assimilate or remain isolated; how did they build their communities and construct a sense of themselves?

II. Humanities Themes 1: *Varieties of Immigrant Experience*

For decades and even centuries, the vivid image of the Melting Pot encouraged our thinking and refreshed our hearts. It told us, in essence, that we could come to the United States as foreigners, yet ours would be an American family, and our children would soon be indistinguishable from all other Americans – heir to the chance to become as successful as, say, an immigrant like Andrew Carnegie. *Only in America!* we told ourselves; to our children we said, *You could grow up to be President!* The idea was cherished because it spoke of America's abiding tolerance, of our democratic ideals, and of a glittering future waiting for us all. The notion of the Melting Pot was, as historian Howard Sachar puts it, "an enduring talisman of the American dream."

The idea was brought forth at least as long ago as 1782, when J. Hector St. John de Crevecoeur described an American "new man" who "[leaves] behind him all his ancient prejudices and manners." Over time, writers as varied as Ralph Waldo Emerson, Frederick Jackson Turner, and Henry James chimed in. The idea behind the Melting-Pot image was universal assimilation: the claim that all immigrant families would gradually melt down (so to speak) into a single standardissue kind of American – U.S. citizens who vote, who speak and write English, with a common cultural literacy. This assimilationist model came under fire in the early 20th century, when Randolph Bourne described "the failure of the 'melting-pot.'" "The discovery of diverse nationalistic feelings among our great alien population," he wrote, "has come to most people as an intense shock." In 1963, Nathan Glazer and Daniel Moynihan's *Beyond the Melting Pot* helped re-define models of immigration. According to historians Juan Flores and David Gutiérrez, most recent scholars of immigration have rejected any sense of the Pot as model; assimilation is *one* of the available options, but there are other possibilities as well. Historians Alejandro Portes and Ruben Rumbaut write of "the bewildering variety of origins, return patterns, and modes of adaptation to American society" in contemporary immigration, and Gutiérrez describes

> the evolution of transnational migration networks, in which migrants move back and forth between communities in two or more [nations], maintain strong ties to both their natal communities and their 'adopted' ones, and maintain their own cultural practices even as they selectively incorporate elements of the culture of the 'host' society.

There have been many descriptions of recent immigration models as multi-culturalism: rather than melting down to a single national culture, immigration has created the “salad bowl,” an "orchestra of cultures" creating a single symphony with different strains of sound.

Meanwhile, in academic circles ye olde Melting Pot is definitely dead. But the idea has led a second if charmed life in both political discourse and the minds of a large part of American society. This fixed idea is not limited to Americans long rooted in the English language: a great many Latinos, Gutiérrez points out, “continue to subscribe to some version of the melting pot theory in their everyday lives.” So it’s an idea that might be maligned or derided, but it still has the power to move and motivate people, like “the American dream” itself.

There are two components to the Melting Pot. It’s a way of describing what has happened, and a way of prescribing what should. Even the past – which we might imagine would be definite, since it’s theoretically over – has a way of being slippery. As Gutiérrez and Project Scholar Gary Gerstle show, there is considerable debate about whether Latinos have been following a trajectory that is similar to earlier groups of immigrants.

According to one perspective, there are signs that Latinos *have* been repeating the classic immigrant history. Gary Gerstle’s recent research attempts to show that, contrary to popular opinion, third- and fourth-generation Latinos do eventually break initial transnational patterns and truly assimilate in the U.S. -- English becomes the primary language, and Spanish is not even spoken by some of these later generations.

The endpoint for the old model, of course, was simply success: the idea was that becoming “American” was the only way to succeed in America. If success means that a group has assimilated, then there is evidence that the Latinos are assimilating. A significant part of the Latino population has become middle-class; according to some data, some Latinos too have been making economic strides; Latino entrepreneurship has mushroomed; and the rocketing demographic growth of the Latino consumer market has brought a boom in Latino media, as well as an array of pop-cultural and cultural heroes.

There is an opposing point of view, and it too is fueled by data. Gutiérrez (who strongly disagrees with Gerstle’s conclusions) points out that in many areas, high-school dropout rates for Latinos approach 50 percent. “Millions of Spanish-speaking workers on both sides of the border toil for poverty-level wages,” he writes. “The rate of Latino poverty is double that of the general population and has persisted at roughly that same level for more than a quarter century.” Alejandro Portes calls this pattern of immigration not assimilation but “segmented assimilation,” in that a segment of the Latino population *does* follow the old Melting Pot model, but a majority of the group stays very much put in the lowest strata of society.

Until recently, success and cultural integration were virtually always linked. But the financial success of the Cuban community in Miami showed that the two are not

necessarily the same: it became clear that under some circumstances people could continue to hold onto their old language and culture and still succeed. But was that a unique or at least rare possibility, a hothouse environment? Is resistance to full assimilation keeping some Latino groups in poverty? The argument is evolving, and certainly won't be resolved for generations. No one knows what Latino society -- and for that matter, America -- will look like in the decades to come.

The crux of the debate between Gerstle and Gutiérrez concerns the similarity or difference between the Latino immigrant experience and the (older) European one. The series won't choose sides here; it will point out both similarities and differences. In the following paragraphs we will compare and contrast Latino and European immigrations, to reveal how their experience (and the world they came to) have affected or might affect the ability and desire to assimilate.

To Assimilate or Not to Assimilate

The first large-scale immigration from Mexico took place at the same time as massive numbers of Europeans were landing at Ellis Island (from 1880 to 1920). Gerstle's research indicates that a number of Europeans (especially Italians and Greeks) led what is now called a transnational existence; many Italian men, for example, traveled to America to support families back home. They led a dual existence, holding onto their language and culture, and their great aim (which sometimes went unfulfilled) was to return home. But some Europeans literally crossed the point of no return from the moment they stepped aboard ship; virtually no Mexicans, closer to their homeland, reached that point. Mexicans came to the U.S. by rail (built to facilitate trade with the U.S.) and by more local means of transportation; very often they could and did return. For many their travels north were seasonal and cyclical: farm workers came north to work the fields, and often had no intention to regard the U.S. as their permanent base. As post-World War II *bracero* (contract worker) Maclovio Medina put it:

> It's always been like that. This isn't something recent. For many years the Mexicans have made our own state in the United States. The people go, some return, and then others go. Then when they return, others go. That's how we go, back and forth.

The result was that immigrants like Medina, as historian Elizabeth Salas has said, "occupied a country that was like an ethnic and cultural middle ground between the U.S. and Mexico: *México flotante* [floating Mexico] – halfway here, halfway home." This doubleness – which Juan Flores calls a "duality born of contending cultural worlds" – has informed the lives of millions from many countries. Some groups of Latinos – especially, perhaps, Puerto Ricans and Dominicans – have tended to form transnational ties instead of settling permanently in a fixed spot. In that way, they have been less likely to become typical "Americans." Many Latinos, too, have become "American" to the point of not allowing their children to speak Spanish; but oftentimes they were (or are) considered "foreign" all the same.

Most European immigrants to the United States came in search of a materially better life; but some came to escape oppression and violence. For many Jewish immigrants, coming to America also meant freedom from discrimination, as well as an opportunity for success. With each succeeding generation, the connections to the new homeland grew stronger. Ties to the old country would eventually diminish and often disappear for good.

Latinos, like their European counterparts, have had similarly varied reasons to emigrate, including the American Dream of economic gain. U.S. wages almost universally dwarfed those in Latin countries: a field worker in Mexico around 1920 might earn 12 cents a day; in the U.S. the daily wage was between eight and twenty *times* higher. It was unsurprising that "El Norte" could look like a bit like El Dorado, as a Mexican *corrido* (ballad) of that time shows:

> *If only you could see how nice*
> *The United States is…*
> *Your watch is on its chain*
> *And your scarf-pin is in your tie*
> *And your pockets are always filled*
> *With plenty of silver.*

But over time there have been numerous other reasons for Latinos to emigrate to the U.S., beyond economic necessity or opportunity – the grinding poverty on the one hand and the presumed watch-chain and tie-pin on the other. Immigration has been triggered by wars, violence, repression, and even natural disaster.

The first large-scale wave of Latino immigration was generated by the ten years of chaos and danger caused by the Mexican Revolution of 1910 against long-term dictator Porfirio Díaz (sending Juan Salvador Villaseñor, one of our characters, north). This flight from terror was only the first example. Our series will relate the stories of María de los Angeles Torres, whose parents put her on a plane to Miami (alone, except for her doll Isabelita) to escape the Castro regime in 1961; of writer Julia Alvarez, whose family fled the wayward violence of Trujillo in the Dominican Republic; and of Carlos Vaquerano from El Salvador, who avoided the death squads in El Salvador in 1980. The political stability of the United States has been a powerful magnet for over a hundred years, and the U.S. has been the genuine homebase, even the cradle, for liberation movements in several Latin countries.

But escape from a dangerous regime in a home country does not always result in assimilation. At times, it's just the opposite. The Cuban enclave in Miami is a good example: the first refugees after the Castro revolution tended to be well-educated middle-class people who never expected to become American. As Project Scholar María Cristina García says, "Because of the United States' long involvement in Cuban affairs, most exiles believed it was merely a matter of time before the United States intervened to replace Castro." Instead they created a hermetic Cuban enclave on U.S. soil. Little Havana, it is called, not without reason.

One might think that Puerto Ricans would be those most eager to assimilate – after all, the island *is* a part of the United States, and the Puerto Rican population on the mainland is of approximately equal size to that remaining on the island. But many Puerto Ricans, like Cubans, nurtured a nostalgic sense of displaced nationalism; in cold New York, the hub Puerto Rican colony on the mainland, some immigrants felt like refugees in the very country that occupied their own.

Perhaps the key difference between Latino and European immigrations has been the fact that their homelands have had very different kinds of relations with the United States. "Unlike earlier waves of European immigrants," Juan Flores says, "Latinos typically move to this country as a direct result of the economic and political relationship of their homelands to the United States." Flores could also have added the word "military" in listing the varieties of relationship the U.S. has maintained with Latin countries. In the past 160 years the U.S. has invaded Mexico, conquered Cuba and Puerto Rico by military force, occupied the Dominican Republic with troops on numerous occasions, and engineered many rebellions and coups in Guatemala, Nicaragua, and elsewhere. With such a background, some scholars argue, Latinos at times might well arrive in this country very much affected by U.S. presence, in their home country, and have a certain natural resistance toward becoming "American" – toward assimilating, in short. Other scholars, however, believe that the powerful presence of the United States in Latin America resulted in Latino familiarity with the U.S. – easing the process of integration. A person from the Dominican Republic, say, might have watched *Lassie* as a kid, or played Little League baseball; the accumulation of such detail is a large component of cultural literacy, and smoothes an immigrant's transition immensely.

There are other reasons why models of straightforward assimilation need not apply to Latino immigration. It's true that Latinos have been around for a long time, since before there even *was* a United States (which is why the first part of our series begins with *californios*, people who became "accidental immigrants" only because the U.S. acquired their home). Yet the overall group of Latinos in the U.S. is of very *recent* composition (which is why half the series takes place in the past 50 years). In that half century there's been a phenomenal rise in the populations of Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans in the U.S., and augmented by the arrival of wholly new populations from Central and South America and the Caribbean. In 1960 there were less than a million foreign-born Latino Americans in the U.S.; forty years later, there were *nine* million foreign-born Mexican-Americans alone, and six million other foreign-born Latinos. This continuing immigration to population centers means that there's always a core of first-generation immigrants in the neighborhood, a constant center of both Spanish language and home culture.

Assimilation to a new culture may depend, in part, on the absence of the old one. Although there were "immigrant sojourners" a hundred years ago, conditions would often limit an immigrant's flexibility and choices. A Swedish person arriving in Minnesota in 1890 would almost have to become American, because he or she could maintain only the most precarious contact with the home country, via letters. It might take generations, but assimilation was almost inevitable then. That initial disconnection no longer exists.

Today people can travel back to their original home with ease in both a literal and figurative sense. There's a galaxy of Spanish-language culture and connections available right in, as they say, your living room. Three prominent U.S. cable networks broadcast in Spanish (Univisión, Telemundo, and Galavisión), other networks (like ESPN) have dual-language broadcasts, voice-over internet telephony (VOIP) offers cheap calls, and the internet itself provides a full range of news, information and entertainment from home.One wonders how quickly the Europeans who arrived a hundred years ago would have assimilated with the world of home so readily available. The option exists: you too can stay immersed in Latino culture in every conceivable way.

One more thing has changed, for immigrants in recent decades. Dominican writer Julia Alvarez wrote of her first years in the United States, in the early 1960s, in the "pre-multicultural studies days, the model for immigration was that you came to America, you assimilated, you cut off your ties to the past and the old ways, and that was the price you paid for the privilege of being an American citizen." Today, as historian Peggy Levitt writes, "the United States tolerates ethnic diversity more. The pressure to conform to a well-defined, standardized notion of what it means to be 'American' has greatly decreased." In other words, it's not just that it's *possible* to remain more Latino, or more transnational, than it once was – in an era when foreignness was a mess that had to be cleaned up as quickly and quietly as possible – it's more *acceptable* as well. As more Latinos have entered the country, it has become permissible in the country at large, and in the Latino community as well, to be more Latino. The final factor, then, is pride. If the Melting Pot is indeed dead, its demise has been caused, in part, by those who have not assimilated – not necessarily because they could not, but because they had other identities in mind. As our viewers will discover, these identities are not only various, they are, in the end, various kinds of Americans: the Latino Americans. "This country is a nation of nations, a congregation of races," Julia Alvarez tells us. "Like Whitman," she says, "I, too, sing America."

Humanities Themes 2: *The Creation of Latino Identity*

To the average non-Latino American today, it is almost an article of faith that Latinos (like African-Americans) share a common cultural identity that binds them together, and always has. But one of the themes of the series will be an examination of that identity: of what Latinos have had in common, what they did not have in common, and (just as importantly) what they have *thought* they had in common. Different groups have had, to put it mildly, diverse backgrounds, opposing political agendas and orientation, and to a degree even different languages. Though many in our audience do not yet know it, Latino identity has been and is a work in progress. Part of the purpose of the series is to show that evolution: the overwhelming diversity in the groups called "Latino," and the history of an identity that is still emerging.

In 1960, there were no Latinos. Or so one could argue. The two largest groups of Spanishspeaking people in the U.S., Mexican-Americans and Puerto Ricans, most commonly thought of themselves as belonging to exactly those groups. They seldom saw an overriding connection between themselves and Spanish speakers from other places,

and just about nobody else did either. As David Gutiérrez recalls, “few observers of American society – including Americans of Latin descent themselves – thought of Latinos as a discernible ‘minority’ population.” Even today, as Juan Flores writes, “many Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, Colombians, Cubans, or Dominicans have no use for catchall phrases [like Hispanic or Latino] and would rather stick to distinct national designations.”

Small wonder. The word “Latino” is an umbrella term, and it’s an especially leaky umbrella. Latinos have come here from a checkerboard of countries; the differences among Latinos in nationality, ethnicity, class and race are legion. “The pan-Latino population [in the U.S.] has never been politically or socially monolithic,” Gutiérrez writes. From the beginning, people in the Spanish colonies of the New World were so racially different that multiple calibrations among white, black, and Native American poles soon found their way into language: there were *mestizos* (Spanish mixed with Native American), *mulatos* (Spanish/black), *zambos* (Native American/black), *coyotes* (*mestizo*/Native American), and more, including *saltra-atrás, chinos*, and *cuarterones*. Today even the Spanish language itself is becoming mixed with English, creating the protean urban language called Spanglish.

Diversity among Latinos is such a hallmark that it’s hard to pin down even a single commonality. With the recent immigration of many *indigenas* from Mexico and Central America, many “Latinos” here were raised with other languages (like Mayan), and speak Spanish as a second language, if at all. Despite standard assumptions to the contrary, a very large percentage of Latinos are *not* immigrants; an enormous number of Latinos have been born in the U.S., and many of them don’t speak Spanish.

The political orientation of various groups (and individuals) is just as varied. A person from Puerto Rico, for example, might harbor dreams of nationalism; a refugee from Cuba might still hope for counter-revolution against Communism; an immigrant from Guatemala might have escaped execution at the hands of a right-wing dictatorship. All in all, it’s not surprising that scholars Marcelo Suárez-Orozco and Mariela Páez are wary of regarding Latinos as a seamless whole: “Bluntly, what does an English-speaking third-generation upper-status white Cuban American in Florida have in common with a Maya-speaking recent immigrant from Guatemala?…. The term *Latino* is a new and ambiguous invention.”

It was not until 1973, during the Nixon administration, that the federal government, invented the category of “Hispanic” for part of the U.S. population; the U.S. Census began to use the term in 1980. But, as essayist Richard Rodriguez points out, “What do you look for when you expect to see a Hispanic face? In fact, there is no such thing as a Hispanic race…. There are Japanese Hispanics. There are African Hispanics. There are blond Hispanics.”

Most scholars say that the Latino identity was invented in the late 60s and early 70s, the celebrated decade of alternative social consciousness. Those were, as Juan Flores writes, “the watershed years in the constructions of a new language of Latino identity. Inspired

by the Civil Rights movement and the opposition to the war against Vietnam…, countless movements, causes and organizations rallied thousands of Chicanos [U.S.-born people of Mexican descent] and Puerto Ricans."

But another, later, factor probably contributed just as much to the making of a "Latino" identity: 20th and 21st century demographics. Before World War II, an enormous percentage of the Spanish-speaking population in the U.S. consisted of Mexican-Americans. Since then, the immigrant population has become much more diverse, with large groups from Puerto Rico, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, and smaller ones from Guatemala, Nicaragua, Honduras, Colombia, Argentina, Peru, Ecuador, and more.

At times, this widening of the diaspora has led to tension or at least dissatisfaction among Latino groups. Puerto Rican journalist Juan Gonzalez remembers a phone call from an older woman in his East Harlem community. Puerto Ricans have lived there in large numbers since 1945, but in the 1990s, Mexicans began to move into the neighborhood. Gonzalez recalls the monologue:

> "Mr. Gonzalez, You have to do something about all these Mexicans. They're taking over our church. The first thing they want to do is put the statue of the Virgen de Guadalupe in the front of the church!… I told them, 'That's your Virgin, not ours.'"

In recent decades there have been tensions and repeated clashes between Mexicans and El Salvadorans in California, between Dominicans and Puerto Ricans in New York, and more. Issues of class and race often divide Latinos, just as they do others in U.S. society. The picture of Latino groups as forming a single harmonious whole is clearly an inaccurate gloss; but that fact shouldn't negate their very real interactions or eliminate any sense of Latino community.

Despite the only very recent emergence of a pan-Latino identity – and the resistance of many to be under that umbrella – it does stand for an emerging sense of commonality among the many groups in the U.S. As Gutiérrez notes, "the intermeshing of different Latino subpopulations [in American cities] has laid the foundation for the emergence and ongoing evolution of a strong sense of *latinidad* [Latinness]."

At the center of *Latinidad* is the (usually) common language: "the Spanish language generates a powerful gravitational field bringing [Latinos] together," Suárez-Orozco and Páez write. As noted above, there is an entire universe of pan-Latino Spanish-language media now available in the United States. The Spanish-language network Telemundo has a slogan aptly describes the effect of Spanish media in general: *Telemundo: uniendo a los Hispanos* [uniting the Hispanics]. But it is not just the Spanish outlets where pan-Latino culture is found: *Latinidad* is part and parcel of popular culture today.

For many decades there was almost no evidence of Latino culture in the mainstream media, especially in Hollywood films and network television. In order to make it in the

Hollywood of 1937, actress Margarita Carmen Cansino dyed her hair red, altered her hairline to minimize her ethnicity, and changed her name… to Rita Hayworth. Even Latino characters were routinely played by non-Anglo actors, like Natalie Wood and George Chakiris in *West Side Story* or Eli Wallach in *The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly*. (Wallach's character, the cruel bandido chief, was fairly standard: Latino men were portrayed as the dark-skinned menace of both the Old West and the modern asphalt jungle.) But today there's a multitude of Latino pop-cultural and cultural luminaries – from Selma Hayek, Ricky Martin, Alex Rodriguez, both Oscar de la Hoya and Oscar de la Renta, Carlos Santana, and Shakira to writers Oscar Hijuelos and Sandra Cisneros, to mention a very few. Even that most South American pop-cultural staple, the *telenovela*, has made it big on American TV: Colombia's *Yo soy Betty, la fea*, recast as *Ugly Betty*. The series was adapted by a Cuban-American, co-produced by a Mexican-American, and stars a Honduran-American, a Puerto Rican, and a Cuban-American. Some might see pop culture as a kind of window dressing, on a mannequin that is always naked underneath. But it is possible too that these matters do matter. Perhaps the existence, success, and especially the mixed composition of a cultural phenomenon like *Ugly Betty* tells us about a new America.

As Geoffrey Fox puts it in *Hispanic Nation*, "something is being made here in the United States, right now…. The whole idea of a 'Latino community' is a home-grown response to discrimination." This Latino-American culture, then, is a new way of tying the multitudinous cultures together, making them stronger. Clearly each group of Latino-Americans has their own story: a distinct culture, history and background. Yet they share the experience of immigration, and the struggle for integration and acceptance, with other Latinos in America – a common experience and language which have begun to coalesce in a common culture that can be called Latino.

The series will have two complementary goals: we will show how diverse various Latino cultures are, and yet show what they share. In *From Bomba to Hip*-Hop, Juan Flores writes of "an ensemble of cultural values and practices":

> Latinos listen to their own kinds of music, eat their own kinds of food, dream their dreams and snap their photos not just to express their difference from… the way the "gringos" do it… Latino identity is the affirmation of cultural and social realities, myths and possibilities, as they are inscribed in their own human trajectory.

III. Creative Approach

In this planning stage of the project, we have concentrated on the storyline in writing the treatment. The treatment included in this proposal reveals our characters, dramatic arc, and themes, but we have not detailed the visual elements. As the scripting process proceeds, we intend to spend a great deal of time on the visual research and approach.

Resources available for the program: Most of the series – the final six hours – is set after the blessed appearance of the motion-picture camera. Some of the earliest archival film

ever shows the funeral for the sailors of the *U.S. Maine*, the ship whose explosive demise triggered the Spanish-American War, and we can also see Teddy Roosevelt's Rough Riders drilling, then gaily setting off for that war itself. From that point on, we have an immense amount of archival film on the public events in our history. From the year 1936 alone (for example) we can watch lettuce packers strike in Salinas, California, a *March of Time* newsreel showing dictator Rafael Trujillo in his limousine and on his yacht, and California border police checking freight trains for "undesirables." We can see the *Fidelistas* roll into Havana in tanks on New Year's Day 1959 – U.S. Marines patrolling streets in the Dominican Republic in 1965 – Cesar Chávez ending his 25-day fast (Bobby Kennedy holds Chávez's head in order for him to eat) in 1968 – Cubans floating to Florida on makeshift rafts in the 80s – or empowering moments of cultural milestones like a Fania All-Stars Salsa Concert at Yankee Stadium. Cameramen followed members of the Puerto Rican group the Young Lords for an entire year. A film *The Lost Apple* was made about the group of children who came without parents from Cuba, Operation Pedro Pan.

Some of our characters are celebrated people – Desi Arnaz, Dolores del Rio, Rita Moreno, Orlando Cepeda, Cesar Chavez – whose lives and moods are captured on plentiful film. Many more are not famous, but alive and well, and can provide us with both on-camera interviews and family albums of snapshots or other images. Diaries, photographs, home movies, and original, evocative photography and recollections by relatives will flesh out our characters' inner lives and private moments. In general, we prefer film to still photographs: wherever possible we'll use period film footage, our own filmed interviews, or home movies of our characters, to recreate the historical feeling of a specific period. The film will never have the feel of a slide show.

We should note that, in contrast to most of the series, the first episode takes place before the invention of photography; most of the first two, before film. For those episodes we'll use a variety of visual elements. We will of course shoot atmospheric natural landscapes in the present, the Rio Grande in the moonlight, the mesas and basins of the border country, fields and graveyards, mills and streams. We will use both period paintings and maps. (Maps do not have to be static images; they can come to life with animation.) Hundreds of period buildings still exist, like the beautifully-preserved mission at San Juan Bautista in California, where the props for many elements of mission life have been assembled and restored (ready for filming). Mines in California and Arizona, similarly, have been carefully preserved, including Sutter's Mill itself.

On occasion, when talking about myths that have been carried down to the present, we will shoot images that are clearly in the present. As historians describe the legendary elements of the Alamo history, for example, we can follow a bus group on a guided tour of the old mission/fort; several untruths or half-truths are still part and parcel of that tour. Similarly, we can use old feature film in *quotation marks*: that is, describe a historical truth that is in *contrast* to the images on screen, as with the Rough Riders in Cuba in 1898.

We will also film numerous small-scale live-action re-creations. We intend to give certain symbolic moments a life of their own – to create visual motifs to reinforce themes or threads in the story. For example, our very first character, Apolinaria Lorenzana, was a foundling baby: she was swaddled in cotton and placed in a revolving window at the entrance to the Royal House for Abandoned Children in Mexico City. The stranger left her there, rang the bell, and ran away. We might film hands placing the baby in the door, the same hands pulling the bell-chain, and hear footsteps receding as we zoom in on the baby. This image can recur whenever Apolinaria faces difficulties in her long life. And the baby, of course, is not just Apolinaria: it is the Latino-Americans, just born, beginning their long history in the north.

We will avoid literal "to the point" re-creations in our filmed sequences, favoring instead evocative sequences that create metaphors for the point the sequence tries to make. We will manipulate frame rates, colors, and focus to underscore the emotion or meaning of a sequence by the way we film – often showing internal images, the images that appear in the mind rather than in life. An example here might be the life of Juan Salvador Villaseñor: his destiny takes the form of the orange dress that his wife-to-be wore the night they met. When he describes his escape from prison as a teenaged boy (the audio tapes exist), we might intercut a ghostly, dreamlike image of that orange dress, the future he is running toward as he runs through a rocky landscape of saguaro cactus, piñon and juniper scrub.

The production team for *The Latino Americans* has made numerous well-received historical documentaries dealing with the distant past. We feel the series is in good hands.

Other productions on related subjects: We're extremely lucky. Our subject is an important and revelatory one, but it has never been comprehensively examined in any television broadcast. There have been film series with similar ambitions on other groups, like *Eyes on the Prize* (for African Americans), the upcoming *We Shall Remain* (a five-episode history of Native Americans), WETA's own six-hour *The Jewish Americans* (from 2007). But Latino history, like much about Latino culture, remains a blank to most Anglo Americans. Other productions have focused on individual parts of this history – like the Zoot Suit Riots or the Clifton-Morenci miners' strike – but no one has connected the dots between past and present, and no one has tried to make the past coherent to both Anglo- and Latino-Americans as comprehensively as this series is poised to do.

C. Storyline

The Latino Americans will be an eight-hour history series, chronological in structure, beginning with the turn of the 19th century, ending with the present. The narrative style will be consistent in each part: history is told in large part through revelatory biographies of historical or living Latinos. We'll hear their voices in virtually every case, first-person quotations in the form of historical readings or present-day interviews with living characters. Their stories will be abetted by historical overview in narration and broadened by thematic or contextual interviews from scholars, including our advisers, that link the

individual stories with larger ones. So there will be a multiplicity of points of view, the result being, we hope, a balanced and fair picture of history.

The story of *The Latino Americans* follows, through eight hours of exciting, passionate television, the movements and lives not of a single people from a single country, but a long series of migrations from different places, over two centuries, to wide-ranging destinations, for multitudinous reasons. Yet the story is not without its unities. One can compare it to a long river that starts small, with a single source (Mexico) but gradually widens as it takes on the flow of water from many tributaries (over a dozen more Latin countries). No two points on that river look the same, but it is a single system, like a tree with myriad branches connected to one root.

The changing nature of U.S. relations with Latin America is a constant theme in and influence on our story, a driving wheel. Until the turn of the 20th century, the American tale was a story of a strapping young country, growing tall and wide through expansion; after the acquisition of Puerto Rico in 1898, the United States ceased to be in the business of conquest, but it never stopped exerting a profound (and often dominant) influence on Latin America, particularly on the countries north of the equator.

Events within the U.S. – our economic booms and busts, our wars hot and cold, our political turnings and re-turnings – began to drive the fates of our neighbors, as the United States became both a magnet for and a trigger of immigration. The metaphor of Push and Pull has been an apt and abiding description of U.S. attitudes toward Latino immigration. American behavior toward Latinos has had the outlines of a roller-coaster – alternately welcoming and threatening. At times the United States literally invited immigration, with such initiatives as the *Bracero* program (which for 23 years tendered government contracts to millions of Mexican workers), or more informally, when job recruiters in the late 40s wound through the poorest *barrios* of Puerto Rico, loudspeakers blaring atop cars, offering jobs in the mainland. But in hard times, the Pull tended to turn into Push: in the 1930s, under the pressure of depression, the United States summarily deported hundreds of thousands of Mexican-Americans. It did the same thing again in the mid-1950s, with (the unfortunately-named) Operation Wetback. Such governmental actions often had private equivalents, as ordinary citizens vilified, harassed, and attacked Latinos.

Our series is built around the stories of individual people. We'll choose and explore the stories of characters that exemplify a greater whole, lives that often describe the macrocosm of history. So it is that the story of ten-year old Maria de los Angeles Torres flight to Miami in 1961, leaving her parents in Cuba, is not just a dramatic story, although it *is* a dramatic story: it also chronicles Castro's revolution and the overthrow of dictator Fulgencio Batista – then the history of Operation Pedro Pan, which funneled more than 14,000 children from Cuba into the U.S. over two years, children who then stayed in camps, Catholic foster homes, and orphanages – then the creation of the Cuban enclave in Miami, and the gradual hardening of their attitudes, their nostalgia for a lost version of Cuba and their fiercely independent stance toward the U.S. All this starts with a single small girl alone on a plane, clutching her dollie.

Latino history is part of the great sweep of American history, but it is in part a history of those swept under the historical rug – a story of fierce discrimination and biting poverty, of multiple tragedies. The history of Latinos in the United States, in other words, is not always a pretty one. But there is much to celebrate at the same time: not only survival, but achievement, of the forging of a new American identity, a story of pride.

One could easily choose characters and stories that would make the series a simple lament, an exercise in martyrology. Or one could, just as easily, make the series into a triumphal march, a succession of success stories, whereby the problems of millions are swept away by the accomplishments of a few. What we will strive for is a story that, taken together, balances triumph and tragedy. Our "voice" will be the voices of all our interview subjects and all our characters, with a full range of emotion and drama.

We do not intend to sugar-coat. At times there is no getting around history. In the first episode, for example, the initial impact of the U.S. take-over on the resident Mexican population of California in 1848 was disastrous and heartbreaking – which is why Leonard Pitt titled his meticulous history *The Decline of the Californios*. Our first hour will tell the story of Apolinaria Lorenzana, the foundling orphan who grew up to be a capable and pious woman. She worked for fifty years in the missions of Spanish California, then became an able and successful ranchowner – only to lose everything when the U.S. seized California. She's a victim, it is true (though one who once accomplished great things), and the history of the conquest of the Southwest is full of such stories. But the second episode then chronicles stories of Latino resistance to discrimination, resistance that gradually became more organized and widespread. Latinos did not passively accept their loss of place and face, and many also accommodated to the changing realities in multiple ways.

Here's one example. The year is 1877. The Spanish-speaking residents of the small west Texas town of San Elizario have for years used salt beds in a dry lake 100 miles to the east, in a wilderness that would be trackless had they not cleared a wagon road to get to the salt. Unsurprisingly, these Latinos consider the salt beds community property. Then an Anglo Judge arrives, establishes a claim on the salt beds, and puts up signs: he expects payment for their use. The Latino residents of the town will not tolerate this; they rise up in a spontaneous rebellion, and fight. They even surround and capture a small detachment of Texas Rangers. It's a Hollywood western waiting to be made, although the real history, without bells on, does not have the cheerful trimmings or happy-ending-nice-and-tidy of a mainstream fairy tale: the rebellious Mexican-Americans executed the Judge via a firing squad, and eventually federal troops rode in to end the Salt Rebellion, killing four men and raping a woman to boot. It's more like *No Country for Old Men* than *The Magnificent Seven*, with heedless violence scattered about everywhere, but in the end it is a gripping story – unknown to the general public – of Latino resilience and courage.

Balance is the key to choosing our stories, picking our spots in a story that spans centuries. We will find stories that do more than merely plumb the distance to the bottom.

When we tell the story of Piri Thomas, an impoverished young Puerto Rican in East Harlem who left school – joined a gang – did and sold drugs, then was busted and imprisoned – it eventually tell of the writing of his astonishing and much-acclaimed autobiography, *Down these Mean Streets.* This is a success story, of course, but success comes in many forms. For one immigrant family, having a child attend college might be a mark of resounding success, a pinnacle of twenty years of struggle. But we won't ignore middle-class immigrants – people whose challenges might be more gentle than sheer survival, people who have the privilege to wonder about their own identity. For these people too are walking in two worlds; their lives too are a part of the Latino-American experience.

The eight episodes are structured as follows:

I. *Accidental Immigrants* (1800-1848)
English and Spanish colonial systems produce two very different kinds of societies, which come in conflict as Manifest Destiny pushes the U.S west. Via the Texas War of Independence and Mexican-American War, U.S. takes half of Mexico's territory by 1848. As the Gold Rush floods California with settlers, the remaining Mexicans (accidental immigrants) of all classes suddenly become second-class citizens, facing discrimination and racial violence, including lynchings.

II. *Resistance* (1850-1900)
As Mexican-American population slowly shrinks, the first signs of resistance to Anglo-American domination appear. It begins with individual acts of lawlessness by a mythical bandido (Joaquin Murieta) in California and a one-man insurrection (Cortina's Wars) on the Texas border, then takes the form of a spontaneous community uprising (the Salt Rebellion) in west Texas, widens into organized, premeditated, and secret rebellion (*Las Gorras Blancas*) in New Mexico, and finally morphs into widespread union action (Clifton-Morenci strikes) in Arizona copper mines.

III. *Push and Pull* (1898-1942)
Widespread immigration to the U.S. begins, with a small group from Cuba, then a larger one from Mexico: both groups flee chaos and violence in their home country. The U.S. helps liberate Cuba, and seizes Puerto Rico, in the brief Spanish-American War; the age of American expansion ends, but the U.S. begins domination of the Caribbean, including frequent military occupation. The first Puerto Rican arrivals (now U.S. citizens) establish a network in New York. In the 20s, immigration is encouraged, and "Latin" style becomes glamorous; but with the Great Depression, the U.S. begins mass deportations of Mexicans, including many U.S. citizens.

IV. *War and Peace* (1942-1954)
World War II is a watershed event for Latino Americans. Hundreds of thousands of men serve in the armed forces, thus establishing a sense of both patriotic and ethnic pride. But discrimination is not dead: in 1942 Anglo servicemen battle hip young "Zoot suiters" in racially-charged riots in southern California. That same year, the *bracero* program begins, bringing thousands of Mexican workers into the manpower-starved U.S. on

government contracts, paving a way for millions more to come illegally. By 1954, illegal immigrants are perceived as a national problem, and the U.S. government cracks down on them in the military-style Operation Wetback in 1954.

V. *The New Latinos* (1946-1965)
In the mushrooming suburbs of the postwar decades, an unusual couple stars in the most popular TV sitcom: Lucy and Desi. Desi exemplifies Latinos for Americans even as Latinos in America are changing. Until World War II, Latino immigration was overwhelmingly Mexican-American. Now three new waves bring large-scale immigration from Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Dominican Republic. In New York City, the development of Puerto Rican gangs becomes an outsized media phenomenon, a dark-skinned threat, in films like *West Side Story*. In 1959, the first Cubans flee the left-wing Castro regime, a relatively white, middle-class flight that soon forms a refugee enclave in Miami. In 1965, LBJ sends Marines to the Dominican Republic, propping up a rightwing dictatorship, triggering a third wave of immigration.

VI. *Pride and Prejudice* (1965-1980)
Spurred on by the Civil Rights cause and the anti-Vietnam movement, young people all over the world, from Paris to Prague to Mexico City, define their identity via the politics of protest. *La* Raza is born; Cesar Chavez and the United Farm Workers manage to elicit the blessing of the American middle class for their agonizingly-long struggle to unionize grape- and lettuce-picking. After many years, they succeed, but Chavez comes in conflict with radical new organizations like the Brown Berets (a Chicano nationalist group from L.A.) and the Young Lords (a Puerto Rican nationalist group from Chicago). If Latino dignity and pride is founded in World War II, this is the generation that defines it, and gives it a pan-Latino identity.

VII. *Children of the Cold War* (1980-1990)
The nature of the Latino diaspora changes again, in large part due to the tides and conflicts of the Cold War as it is fought in the Western Hemisphere. In 1980 Castro's Cuba sends a second group of immigrants to the United States, the Mariel exodus; for Castro these are the unwanted, but their "criminal" nature is much overplayed in the American media. Among Cubans, the "/Marielitos/" initially face rejection, but are ultimately absorbed into the thriving Cuban enclave. The nature of the Puerto Rican community also changes, refreshed by a wave of middle-class professional immigrants that changes the complexion of the multi-generational community in the United States. But far more, dramatic, is the sudden and dramatic arrival of hundreds of thousands of Central Americans (El Salvadorans, Guatemalans, and Nicaraguans) fleeing the violence of a Cold war played out on Central American soil in the 1980s due largely to political horrors at home – death squads, mass murders, and more.

VIII. *The Great Debate* (1992-present)
By the early 1990s, the most incendiary political firestorm of our day – the debate over illegal immigration – had begun. Globalization, empowered by NAFTA, meant that U.S. manufacturers moved south, even as Mexican workers came north in record numbers, much to the resentment of American workers. The backlash included tightened borders,

anti-bilingualism, and a bill to declare all illegal immigrants felons. But a sea change was underway: the coalescence of a phenomenon called Latino-American culture – braiding multitudinous strands into one strong link. Is a new Latino world aborning here? Or will Latinos in America eventually assimilate into invisibility, as other groups have done so many times here, in this most protean country?

D. Audience

We'll use a comprehensive multi-media strategy to reach both English- and Spanish-speaking audiences. PBS has agreed to waive their usual exclusivity in North America so the series can reach a Spanishlanguage audience. Thus the series will be available not only to core public-television viewers, but to millions of atypical viewers as well. We're currently negotiating with V-me, the Spanish Language Network distributed by PBS Digital channels, to broadcast the series; by 2011, V-me is projected to reach 85% of all Latino households in the United States.

We are also negotiating several other agreements: with NPR, to create half-hour companion radio programs for one of NPR's tentpole program's such as *Morning Edition*; with StoryCorps, the awardwinning oral history project, to create short video interstitials from their oral histories they will conduct with Latino Americans; and with the Hispanic Communications Network, to create Spanish-language content to air on over 275 radio stations.

With the combination of broadcasts on PBS and V-me, a companion radio series on English- and Spanish-speaking stations, and an extensive promotion and grassroots outreach campaign (also in dual languages), *The Latino Americans* is poised to become a landmark media event.

With the heated current debate over immigration, the series will draw in not only the audiences who traditionally watch history and public-affairs programs – an audience which in itself (based on past ratings) of some 10 million viewers – but *also* a sector that is more usually attracted to the hot-button topics of news and news magazines. Recent studies of the PBS audience done for the CPB show that public-affairs programming resonates with our audience, building on the trust they have for PBS. So it is that we will have an opportunity to present the sensitive issues in this documentary with unusual fairness, accuracy, depth and context.

The question of Immigration today is a firestorm, and Latino immigration is its white-hot center. Oddly enough, very few people know the background of the debate; thus this proposal.

The generalized study of American history that most of our audience will have made in high school or college includes little of the story of Latino Americans, and it is an astonishing story. Much of it will be a surprise to (and an education for) a general audience. Some of those surprises will be very specific: most viewers will not be aware that some of those who fought and died in the Alamo were Latino; that many of the first Anglo settlers in both Texas and California were illegal aliens; that places like Utah were part of Mexico until 1848; that the first laws to establish quotas for immigration specifically exempted the Western Hemisphere; that many thousands of U.S. citizens were deported during the Great Depression; or that Mexican workers were literally invited north by the U.S. government itself for many years.

More generally, and more importantly, few viewers will know that history is in the process of repeating itself. There have been repeated outcries about immigration in the course of our history; every time, the protestors have claimed that newcomers are making us as a country somehow less

"American," as if America had been built by non-immigrants; every time, immigrants have been the scapegoats for setbacks, especially economic downturns.

Crucially, too, Latino immigration has been caused not only by events in countries to the south, but by attitudes and policy in the U.S. Adviser David Gutiérrez claims that "Americans continue to deny any responsibility for … more than nine decades of institutionally supported immigration from Mexico. [They]… indulge instead in the demonization of illegal aliens." We aren't entirely convinced that there is always an intentional denial of history behind this anti-immigrant stance; we believe that most Americans are simply unaware of the history that Gutiérrez knows so well. The trope of Push and Pull in our series will not only help us put a frame around decades of history, it will help the viewer frame the present-day debate in a historical context. The influence of American foreign policy, too, has been decisive in driving immigration from many Latin countries; although our viewers probably realize that immigration from Cuba was linked to the Cold War, it's less certain that they'll know the enormous part played by Cold-War politics in bringing millions of people from Central America and the Dominican Republic.

The short version is this: our subject is something that virtually everyone cares about, yet at the same time it is a history that has something to teach almost everyone.

E. Format

The central component of the series is an eight-hour series of documentary films for PBS broadcast. Many books, including good ones by our advisers, exist on the subject of Latino-American history; there are even departments of Latino Studies at many universities. But our central goal is to give a balanced understanding of this history to a wide general public. For this purpose, a television series is the desired format, reaching millions.

Similarly, we'll present the history in a lively manner that will appeal to that public: the series focuses on the lives and deaths of individual people, creating drama and emotion. Biographies of average as well as celebrated characters will help us connect to average viewers.

About half the series focuses on immigration from Mexico, and the lives of Mexican-Americans, for demographic and historical reasons: the first and for many years the only Latino "immigrants" were Mexican. (The word is in quotation marks because the first Mexican immigrants, as Scholar Juan Flores has remarked, didn't cross the border – the border crossed them.) Even today, after recent large-scale migrations from many countries, about 60% of the Latino Americans are of Mexican heritage.

An extensive website for *The Latino Americans* project, housed on PBS.org, will be available in both English and Spanish. In addition to providing complete thematic content modules which will include expanded content from the film, the site will also serve as a hub for streaming extended clips from the film, as well as exclusive web-only video footage from the production not contained in the broadcast.
For ***general viewers, public audiences, children and students*** the site will: 1) leverage and extend interest to and from the broadcast series; 2) engage visitors with Latino-American history and its impact on the nation; 3) encourage exploration and discovery of the film's themes with multimedia opportunities for user-generated story sharing and 4) encourage an appreciation of Latino-American history and culture.

For ***professional audiences of teachers and community engagement leaders*** the Web site will 1) offer rich online classroom and discussion materials and educational resources; 2) explore links between Latino-American history and current events; 3) utilize user-generated stories to provide context and understanding of differences and similarities across Latino cultures; 4) establish an archive of streaming video interviews with historians and others from the film; and 5) provide the context for discussion in the national conversation about immigration.

The third-generation Internet (Web 3.0) is expected to create a more open flow of information into and out of major content providers like PBS. To support this new level of content-sharing, parts of the site will be written and developed so that application and content developers outside of PBS can access and use that information. This will allow bloggers, writers and/or application developers access to high-quality content and research on Latino history and culture – making PBS a library or resource center where information can be pulled out and used in other ways.